



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/500,419	06/25/2004	Hsua-Ming Shih	LPTF02	9298
<div>J C Patents Suite 250 4 Venture Irvine, CA 92618</div>				
7590			03/05/2008	
<div>EXAMINER FATAHI YAR, MAHMOUD</div>				
ART UNIT			PAPER NUMBER	
2629				
MAIL DATE			DELIVERY MODE	
03/05/2008			PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/500,419	SHIH, HSUA-MING	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	MAHMOUD FATAHI YAR	2629	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 November 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 31-48 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 31-48 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 25 June 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>11/12/04</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 31-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claims 31, 34, 36, 37, 39, 40, 42, 45 and 46, respectively, every occurrence of the recitation "the said" is confusing and it should read as - - said - - or - - the - -.

In claim 31, lines 7-8, there is no clear antecedent basis for "the insulation membrane".

In claims 33, 40 and 42, respectively, the recitation "buffering layer" is vague and indefinite because it is not clear to what it refers.

In claim 35, lines 3-4, there is no clear antecedent basis for "the silver paste or the mixture material of the silver paste and the carbon paste".

In claim 37, lines 4 and 6, the recitation "education electrical connection" is vague and indefinite because it is not clear to what it refers. Correction and/or clarification is required.

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 31-34 and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ogata(5,903,252) in view of Fukuzaki(5,635,684) and Ichikawa et al (the cited Japanese publication JP11-110135).

Ogata discloses an electronic whiteboard apparatus comprising a frame(1), a writing or drawing sheet(2), a spool and wring-springs(10,11,13) which all function as claimed. Ogata substantially show all the features of the above claims except for the "membrane antenna array", "an underlayer", "induction layer", "insulation layer", "shield layer" and "buffering layer". However, Fukuzaki is cited to show that the concept of utilizing a membrane antenna arrays of interlaced conductors(figure 3) in a touch panel is old; And Ichikawa et al is cited to show that the concept of utilizing an induction layer(5), an insulating layer(6), a shield layer(4) and a buffering layer(the second layer 6) in a touch panel is old. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system of Ogata with the above noted teachings of Fukuzaki and Ichikawa et al such that to utilize an integrated membrane of antenna arrays with multiple layers such as shield layer , under layer, buffering layer and insulation layer because all the applied references are related to use of a touch input device for determining the coordinate location of a touch.

4. Claims 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ogata, Fukuzaki and Ichikawa et al as applied to claim 31 above, and further in view of Nishikawa et al(6,847,355B1).

Nishikawa et al is cited to show that the concept of utilizing conductive layers formed by silver paste or the mixture material of silver paste and the carbon paste is old(column 8, lines 1-11). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art apply the noted teaching of Nishikawa et al to the modified system of Ogata because all the applied references are related to use of matrix conductors in a touch panel input device.

5. Claims 37-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ogata, Fukuzaki, Ichikawa et al and Nishikawa et al as applied to claim 36 above, and further in view of Knopf(7,170,468B2).

Knopf is cited to show that the concept of utilizing a plurality of pieces of touch panels(108, 308) connected together at their edges by some sort of electrical connection means(202; for example pin-type connection means) is old((column 3, lines 57-67 and column 4, lines 1-25). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to apply the noted teachings of Knopf to the modified system of Ogata such that to provide a plurality of membrane antenna arrays connected together at their edges by some sort of electrical connection means because all the applied references are related to use of touch input device for detecting the coordinated of a touch location.

6. Claims 39-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ogata, Fukuzaki and Ichikawa et al as applied to claim 31 above, and further in view of Van Ruymbeke(6,380,930B1).

Van Ruymbeke is cited to show that the concept of mounting components(26,28,30,32,34) of a control circuit on a printed circuit board(20) is a touch input device is old. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to apply the noted teaching of Van Ruymbeke to the modified system of Ogata because the applied references are related to a touch input device.

7. Claims 46-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ogata, Fukuzaki and Ichikawa et al as applied to claim 31 above, and further in view of Takala et al(6,788,294B2).

Takala et al is cited to show that the concept of utilizing a flexible and foldable touch input membrane is old(column 5, lines 50-65). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of one ordinary skill in the art to apply the noted teaching of Takala et al to the modified system of Ogata such that to use a flexible white board which can be furled and carried conveniently because all the applied references are related to use of membrane touch input device.

In claims 47-48, as to the limitations "spool, wring-springs and a fixing buckle", such are shown to be old by Ogata((see figure 7).


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mike Fatahiyar whose telephone number is (571)272-7688. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 9:30 to 6:00.

Art Unit: 2629

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richard Hjerpe, can be reached on 571-272-7691. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'MF', located in the lower right quadrant of the page.


M. Fatahiyar
March 2, 2008